

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected the claims as follows: Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0065788 A1 to Salomaki; Claims 4 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salomaki in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0120760 A1 to Kimchi et al.; and Claims 5, 7-8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salomaki in view of Kimchi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6480957 B1 to Liao et al. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salomaki in view of Liao et al. and further in view of Kimchi et al.

Regarding the §102(e) rejection of independent Claim 1, the Examiner states that Salomaki discloses, “transmitting only updated presence attribute data, created after releasing the previous connection, from among current presence attribute data to the client terminal.” However, Salomaki discloses, that when a client terminal connects to a server and requests present attribute data, “the PS sends 205 one or more presence attributes to SS, if this is allowed by the publication preferences of B). It is possible that the publication preferences set by client B prevent some part of the requested information from being sent (to client A or in general).” (Salomaki, paragraph [0060], lines 34-39). Salomaki’s disclosed limitation on transmitted presence data is based on another client’s preferences, but not based upon whether an attribute was updated since releasing the previous connection.

Salomaki further discloses, “The MC preferably stores presence information (presence attribute values) until new presence attribute values are received in an update message used to carry presence attributes (or the client finishes the mobile IMPS session).” (Salomaki, paragraph [0062], lines 5-9).

As the preferred client of Salomaki does not store presence information after an IMPS session is completed, a reconnecting client will request not only updated presence attribute information created after releasing the previous connection, but all current attribute presence data. Therefore, Salomaki fails to teach, disclose, or suggest, “transmitting only updated presence attribute data, created after releasing the previous connection, from among current presence attribute data.” Therefore, Salomaki fails to anticipate Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the 103(a) rejection of independent Claim 9, the Examiner states that Kimchi et al. discloses, “if the client terminal is reconnected to the server having been previously connected to the client terminal to perform the messenger service, controlling the client terminal to request presence attribute data to be updated by the server (page 29 [00400] lines 1-8).” (Office Action, page 5). Kimchi et al. discloses transmitting a Call/Ended transaction upon reconnection to a service, but does not teach, disclose, or suggest that the Call/Ended transaction is a request for presence attribute data to be updated by the server. (Kimchi et al., paragraph [00400]). The Examiner also states that Salomaki discloses, “transmitting only updated presence attribute data, created after releasing the previous connection, from among current presence attribute data to the client terminal.” (Office Action, pages 4-5). However, as explained above regarding Claim 1, Salomaki does not teach, disclose, or suggest the above-quoted limitation.

Further, Kimchi et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Salomaki. All of the claimed features of independent Claim 9 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Salomaki and Kimchi et al. or by either reference alone. Therefore, the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claim 9. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of independent Claims 5 and 12, the Examiner states that Salomaki discloses, “transmitting only the updated presence attribute data to the client terminal. However, as explained above regarding Claim 1, Salomaki does not teach, disclose, or suggest the above-quoted limitation. The Examiner also states that Liao et al. discloses “a client terminal for creating a synchronization key value composed of current stored session ID and client ID, and an ID of a transaction completed during a communication between the server and the client when the client is reconnected to a server.” (Office Action, page 7). Liao et al. does disclose a transmitting a transaction ID for communication and performing an authentication, but does not teach, disclose, or suggest a synchronization key composed of a stored session ID, a client ID, and an ID of a completed transaction created when the client is reconnected to the server. (Liao et al., column 12, line 36-column 13, line 24).

Further, regarding Claim 12, Kimchi et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest, “requesting from the server presence attribute data to be updated using the created synchronization key value,” for at least the reasons stated above regarding Claim 9.

Kimchi et al. and Liao et al. do not cure the deficiencies of Salomaki. All of the claimed features of independent Claims 5 and 12 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Salomaki, Kimchi et al., and Liao et al., or by either reference alone. Accordingly, the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claims 5 and 12.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-11 are dependent claims, and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given above with regard to their respective independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 12.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-12 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, PC
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475